

*I came to Milan, and to Ambrose, its bishop, a man famed throughout the world as one of its very best men, and your devout worshiper.*

- Augustine, ca. 397 CE<sup>1</sup>

*Ambrosius, of Milan, was a violent official, ignorant of all theology, whom a reputation for violence in the church had raised to the rank of bishop...*

- Heinrich Graetz, 1893<sup>2</sup>

Cultural identities both shape, and are shaped by, the inherited collective biographical memories of great heroes of the past, such as the Christian saint. Yet it is no secret that incidents in the lives of these saints deemed to be problematic for the individuals and communities remembering them present these communities with quite a conundrum: How does one deal with this unsettling information while continuing to honor the remembered character and deeds of the saint?

This paper will examine the reception history of one such incident in the life of one such saint: the destruction of a synagogue in Callinicum and the reaction of Ambrose of Milan. By the time of his death, Ambrose was already well-known throughout the Mediterranean world, and his popularity only grew following his death as his life and deeds were immortalized through hagiographers and church historians. Among his notable characteristics is his willingness and ability to speak truth to power, memorialized in both literature and artwork for persuading Gratian to remove the Altar of Victory from the Senate hall in Rome and placing Theodosius I under penance and removing him from communion following the massacre of citizens in Thessalonica by order of Theodosius.

However, arguably the boldest stand Ambrose took against an emperor was often not included in works recounting his life until modern times, and is still omitted in hagiographic accounts today. This is the Callinicum affair which, while discussed by Ambrose and his earliest biographer, is largely omitted in subsequent presentations of his life. The first two parts of this paper will examine the earliest accounts of the Callinicum affair, as well as early sources of Ambrose's life which omit it. I will argue

---

<sup>1</sup> *Confessions* 6.2; trans. John K. Ryan (New York: Doubleday, 1960).

<sup>2</sup> *History of the Jews*, Vol. II (Philadelphia: JPSA, 1893) 614.

that, while we may see continuity between Ambrose's response to the Callinicum affair and his other confrontations with imperial authority, his strongly negative views towards Judaism, and his concern for non-Christian sacred spaces to be replaced by Christian holy sites, nevertheless, his response to Callinicum stood at odds with the emerging biographical/hagiographical image in later Christian writers. What Marita Sturken writes of national history, holds true no less for ecclesiastical history:

The remembrance of events and biographies of national importance moves between the realms of cultural memory and history. History is composed of narratives that have been sanctioned in some way, that often tell a self-conscious story of the nation...Within national discourse the stakes of biography are high; the meaning of certain life stories helps to shape the ways in which the nation and its history are defined.<sup>3</sup>

Because of the tension between the history of the Callinicum event and the cultural memory of Ambrose's character, the story is omitted in later accounts of his life. As Anna Lucille Boozer notes:

The corollary to memory is forgetting. When we select certain aspects of our past to remember, we allow other aspects to be forgotten. While remembering may be critical for the construction and constitution of both individual and group identities, forgetting also facilitates the crafting of identities...<sup>4</sup>

Nevertheless, although I have not been able to pinpoint exactly when this happened, eventually historians began to include and reflect upon the Callinicum incident, and of course, it is difficult to imagine today a critical biography of Ambrose (or Theodosius) which does not discuss the event. The second part of this paper will survey several writers from the seventeenth to the early twentieth century which *do* include this incident in their discussions of Ambrose, examining how their interpretations of this incident affect their portrait of Ambrose (and vice versa). Here we will see a few distinct trends:

---

3 "Personal Stories and National Meanings: Memory, Reenactment, and the Image," in *The Seductions of Biography*, ed. Mary Rhiel and David Bruce Suchoff (New York: Routledge, 1996) 31.

4 "Forgetting to Remember in the Dakhleh Oasis, Egypt," in *Cultural Memory and Identity in Ancient Societies*, ed. Martin Bommas (London: Continuum, 2011) 109.

justification of Ambrose's actions, vilification of his character, and holding the event in tension with his perceived overall character (a flawed, but nevertheless good man). I will also note some authors from more recent centuries who continue to omit the event from their historical reconstructions.

## **I. Remembrance of Callinicum**

The main primary sources of information regarding the destruction of a synagogue in Callinicum by Christians in the fourth century at the instigation of their bishop are Ambrose's Letters 40 and 41. In Letter 40, Ambrose writes to the emperor Theodosius pleading with him not to follow through on his stated course of action to require the destroyed synagogue to be rebuilt at the expense of the bishop of Callinicum. In Letter 41, written to Ambrose's sister, he describes a subsequent account in which Ambrose preaches a homily in church (with Theodosius present) against Theodosius' plan to rebuild the synagogue, then is confronted by Theodosius following the liturgy. In this account, Theodosius promises to rescind his order and is restored to communion. The events recounted in these two letters are recorded and summarized in the earliest biography of Ambrose by Paulinus the deacon, who cites Ambrose's Letter 41 as a source.<sup>5</sup>

In 388 CE, Ambrose writes to the emperor Theodosius concerning the latter's response to a recent violent uprising by Christians against Jews in Callinicum. The details of what preceded this incident are unknown, but according to the letter, a synagogue had been burned at the instigation of the local bishop. Theodosius has commanded that those responsible for the arson should be punished, while the bishop who incited the incident should pay for the synagogue's rebuilding.<sup>6</sup>

Ambrose objects to Theodosius' planned course of action and pleads with him to reconsider for the following reason: By placing this burden on the bishop, Theodosius risks making him either a martyr or an apostate.<sup>7</sup> However, Ambrose argues further that the burning of the synagogue is justified

---

<sup>5</sup> *Life of St. Ambrose* 22.

<sup>6</sup> Letter 40.6; trans. anon. (Oxford: James Parker and Co., 1881).

<sup>7</sup> 40.7.

so that no place may exist where Christ is denied, and he goes so far as to accept the blame for the incident himself.<sup>8</sup> If Theodosius wishes to punish someone, let him punish Ambrose! He further reasons that if *anyone* were to merely obey this order and rebuild the synagogue using church funds, that person would be committing an act of apostasy.<sup>9</sup> Clearly at issue for Ambrose is the rhetorical effect this rebuilding would have on society, as he calls to mind pagan temples which had been built by the plunder of conquered enemies.<sup>10</sup>

Sensing Theodosius' political motives in keeping the peace, Ambrose draws a line in the sand: If your primary loyalty is not with the Christians, it is against us! And really, Ambrose reasons, what does Theodosius have to lose? If he is concerned that a building of no significance has been burned, there are many examples of similar incidents that have gone unpunished.<sup>11</sup> If he is concerned specifically because it was a synagogue, he should take note of the divine punishment meted out to those who tried to rebuild the Temple under Julian.<sup>12</sup> Ambrose goes on to give examples of churches burned by Jews under Julian and never rebuilt.<sup>13</sup> Furthermore, if Christians rebuild the synagogue, to be consistent, will they rebuild pagan temples that have been destroyed?<sup>14</sup> Ambrose concludes by couching his appeal in terms of his love for Theodosius, Theodosius' record of pardoning others, the damage this decision could do to Theodosius' reputation, and finally, a threat to make his opposition public in the church if his advice is not heeded.

The next letter in our extant corpus from Ambrose<sup>15</sup> is to his sister and also discusses this incident. He recalls the text of a homily he preached in church subsequent to his letter to Theodosius. The bulk of the homily employs a creative matrix of OT and NT texts to preach a general message of

---

8 40.8.

9 40.9.

10 40.10.

11 40.13.

12 40.12.

13 40.15.

14 40.16.

15 Letter 41.

forgiveness, understood in the context of this letter as a veiled appeal to Theodosius to forgive the Christian arsonists and their instigator-bishop for burning the synagogue.<sup>16</sup> However, his motives become more explicit in the sermon, as the church is contrasted with the synagogue. The “kiss” of the church is likened to the woman who “has not ceased to kiss [Jesus’] feet” (Lk 7:45), while the “kiss” of the synagogue is likened to that of Judas.<sup>17</sup> Finally, Ambrose is explicit in addressing the emperor from the altar, employing him publicly to pardon the arsonists.<sup>18</sup>

After the sermon, Theodosius assures Ambrose that the offenders will be pardoned and that he will end his investigation into the incident, whereupon Ambrose agrees to serve him communion.<sup>19</sup>

This account, coming completely from Ambrose himself and summarized by his earliest biographer Paulinus<sup>20</sup> about 25 years after Ambrose’s death, is our primary source of information about the incident.<sup>21</sup> No archaeological evidence confirming this event has been found in Raqqa.<sup>22</sup> It is impossible to confirm the details of this account, particularly the exchange between Ambrose and Theodosius in the church. I will proceed more or less taking for granted that the synagogue was destroyed in Callinicum in the manner in which Ambrose relates it, as it accounts historically for Ambrose’s writing Letter 40. I also take it for granted that Theodosius did indeed reverse his planned course of action regarding the punishment of Christians in Callinicum at Ambrose’s insistence, as this could have been easily verified by his sister, to whom he wrote Letter 41, had it not occurred. I will not deal with whether the exchange in the church between Ambrose and Theodosius occurred as it is related in Letter 41, as it is both impossible to say and beyond the scope of this paper.

---

16 41.2-12.

17 41.14-16.

18 41.26.

19 41.27-28.

20 It seems clear that Paulinus bases his account on Ambrose’s two letters.

21 It is also mentioned in correspondence between Libanius and Gamaliel, although I have not yet been able to examine this reference.

22 Modern day Callinicum.

## Modern Scholarship on Callinicum

If we do assume the basic historicity of 1) the destruction of the synagogue, 2) Ambrose's response, and 3) Theodosius' rescission of his original order, there are a number of things we can say to situate this incident historically, and indeed, it has received a fair amount of scholarly attention in recent years. One aspect of this incident which, although mentioned 80 years ago by Salo Wittmayer Baron, could certainly be explored more, is the significance of the geographical location of Callinicum near the border of the Roman and Persian empires. Baron writes:

Geographically...the Jews occupied a singular position between the two empires. There were densely populated Jewish settlements on both sides of the frontiers for hundreds of miles. In the constant struggle between the two powers, the Jews held something like a strategic position. That few immediate benefits accrued to them from this situation, and that indeed they suffered severe losses during the long and devastating wars, was partly the result of their nonpolitical attitude, which militated against definite alliance with one power or the other. Neutrality, as usual, aroused the ire of both belligerents.<sup>23</sup>

This political situation could certainly have influenced Theodosius' initial response to hold Christians accountable in what otherwise seems to be an insignificant town at the extreme edge of the empire.<sup>24</sup> At the same time, as J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz notes, Ambrose's intervention in an affair occurring in such a distant location establishes himself as a major player in procuring political power for the church over the state.<sup>25</sup> Along these lines, Neil B. McLynn provides helpful context to Ambrose's original letter to

---

23 *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, Vol. II: Christian Era: The First Five Centuries (Philadelphia: JPSA, 1937) 176; see pp. 172-214.

24 Johannes Hahn helps to situate the Callinicum incident by recognizing the political situation of the Jews in late antiquity: Constantine had inherited an empire in which Jews were generally granted limited protection under the law to practice their religion. With the burning of the synagogue at Callinicum, Theodosius is acting in accordance with this general recognition of rights which had been historically granted to Jews. To combat this, not only presents Theodosius with the dichotomy of either making the bishop of Callinicum a martyr or an apostate, but takes responsibility for the act himself, thus making Theodosius' planned course of action a perceived direct attack on the church. This presented Theodosius with the choice of being remembered as another Constantine or another Julian. See Hahn, "The Challenge of Religious Violence: Imperial Ideology and Policy in the Fourth Century," in ed. Johannes Weinand, *Contested Monarchy: Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century AD* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015) 379-404.

25 *Ambrose and John Chrysostom: Clerics Between Desert and Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011) 91-94.

Theodosius by noting that it survives originally as an appendage to a different letter. Read in this context, McLynn sees Ambrose's use of the incident at Callinicum as a pretext for addressing larger concerns with Theodosius, i.e. opening lines of communication between the bishops and the emperor.<sup>26</sup>

Some recent treatments have continued to view the Callinicum incident within the larger *contra Judaeos* phenomenon that can be seen from the New Testament period down to the present day.<sup>27</sup> This is certainly appropriate, especially given Ambrose's strong rhetoric throughout his writings against Jews and Judaism, symbolized by "the Synagogue," which is contrasted with "the Church," emblematic of (in his view) orthodox Christians and Christianity.<sup>28</sup>

Others have sought to both elaborate on and move beyond the *contra Judaeos* paradigm to understand this incident and its aftermath. For instance, Catherine Chin demonstrates the tension between church and state in the conflict between Ambrose and Theodosius. She begins by focusing on Ambrose's apparent assumption that riots and the destruction of public buildings are a fact of life and his argument that Theodosius' efforts would be more appropriately directed at avenging the destruction of a prefect's house in Rome, for instance, rather than a synagogue in Syria. Because Theodosius planned to act without hearing from the bishop of Callinicum or consulting other bishops about the matter, his actions are misguided and misappropriated and will result in the rebuilt synagogue becoming a monument of the synagogue's alliance with the empire against the church.<sup>29</sup>

Michael Gaddis approaches this incident in his study of religious violence in late antiquity as one of several unique cases of violent acts reported by the perpetrators or their sympathizers. He frames

---

<sup>26</sup> *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital* (Berkeley: UC Press, 1994).

<sup>27</sup> See Robert Michel, *Holy Hatred: Christianity, Antisemitism, and the Holocaust* (New York: Macmillan, 2006); Joseph E. Sanzo and Boustán Ra'anan, "Mediterranean Jews in a Christianizing Empire," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Attila*, ed. Michael Mass (New York: Cambridge, 2015) 358-375.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. *De Abraham* 7.61: Commenting on Is. 66:9 ("Have I not made the bearing and barren woman?" saith the Lord"), Ambrose writes, "...[T]his saying may be referred to the mystery of the Synagogue and the Church, because the Synagogue, which was deprived of the posterity of succession, ceased to bear fruit, and the assembly of nations, which was barren when it knew not God, began to have offspring." Trans. Theodosia Tomkinson. Cf. Gregory Figueroa, *The Church and the Synagogue in St. Ambrose* (Washington, D.C.: CUA Press, 1949).

<sup>29</sup> "Built from the Plunder of Christians: Words, Places, and Competing Powers in Milan and Callinicum," in ed. Nathaniel P. DesRosiers and Lily C. Vuong, *Religious Competition in the Greco-Roman World* (Atlanta: SBL, 2016) 63-76.

the discussion of this incident in terms of extremism vs. moderation in relation to Christians' interaction with other religious groups. For those he terms extremists, conflict is framed as a manifestation of a cosmic battle between good and evil, and thus, violence is justified in combating those who are seen to be inspired by demonic forces, for the sake of preserving the honor of the Christian religion.<sup>30</sup>

Thomas Sizgorich also frames the event in the context of religious violence in late antiquity, seeing Ambrose's arguments in his epistle to Theodosius as framed primarily by a narrative of Christian persecution which had developed prior to that time, and by now had included actions that occurred under Julian. Because the martyrdom accounts pitted Christians against emperors, Ambrose's suggestion that the bishop of Callinicum's potential refusal to follow Theodosius' orders could make him a martyr illustrate one of the rhetorical effects of martyrdom stories and the dilemma with which one like Theodosius was faced when facing the risk of one of his subjects being hailed as a martyr by large portions of the populace.<sup>31</sup>

In my view, perhaps the most helpful recent treatment, and the area in which more work remains to be done, is Christine Shepardson's situating the Callinicum incident within the context of contested space in late antiquity.<sup>32</sup> While she is primarily concerned with contested space in Antioch, Shepardson's discussion of Callinicum occurs in a chapter discussing areas in the empire other than Antioch. Ambrose's correspondence concerning Callinicum is examined to argue that Ambrose uses rhetoric to persuade his audience that "control over the city belonged to him, shaping the religious topography" in similar ways to leaders in Antioch.<sup>33</sup>

---

30 *There is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ: Religious Violence in the Christian Roman Empire* (Berkeley: UC Press, 2005) 208-250.

31 *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity: Militant Devotion in Christianity and Islam* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012) 81-107.

32 *Controlling Contested Places: Late Antique Antioch and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy* (Berkeley: UC Press, 2014) 204-240.

33 *Ibid.*, 226. This rhetoric is perhaps best seen in Ambrose's funeral oration for Theodosius. Why, for instance, in a funeral oration for *Theodosius* does Ambrose spend so much time discussing *Constantine* and his mother *Helen*? Constantine is seen as marking a crucial turning point in history, symbolizing the Christianization of the empire. This is



## II. Omission of the Callinicum Narrative

Roughly two and a half decades after Ambrose's death, at the request of Augustine of Hippo, the deacon Paulinus, having been himself an associate of Ambrose, penned his life. As has already been mentioned, this work, which in terms of genre hovers somewhere between an encomiastic biography and the emerging distinct genre of hagiography, includes the incident at Callinicum. However, in the centuries that followed, among our extant historians, none mention it. This is perhaps not so striking when considering some historians. Socrates Scholasticus, for instance, has relatively little to say about Ambrose.<sup>34</sup> Although this text mentions Ambrose's opponent Symmachus,<sup>35</sup> it is not in relation to Ambrose, and neither the altar of Victory nor the Thessalonian massacre are mentioned.

This latter event, however, is mentioned by both Sozomen<sup>36</sup> and Theodoret.<sup>37</sup> This is significant because it is primarily this event which comes to emblemize Ambrose's speaking truth to power. The image often associated with this event – Ambrose standing in the doorway to the cathedral and blocking Theodosius' entrance – has been immortalized in numerous pieces of artwork, most notably the nearly identical paintings of the event by Peter Paul Rubens (below, left) and his student Anthony van Dyck (below, right).

---

illustrated by both Constantine's and Helen's transformation of the topography into sites of Christian memory. However, having lived through Julian's brief reign and attempt to reverse this transformation, Ambrose sees Theodosius as having acted as Josiah in the books of 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles in his having "removed sacrilegious errors, closed temples, [and] destroyed idols" (*De obitu Theodosii* 38; trans. Leo McCauley (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1953).

<sup>34</sup> See his *Hist. Eccl.* 4.30; 5.11.

<sup>35</sup> *Hist. Eccl.* 5.14.

<sup>36</sup> Soz., *Hist. Eccl.* 7.25.

<sup>37</sup> Theod. *Hist. Eccl.* 5.17.



Yet, as H. A. Drake notes, the boldness with which Ambrose confronts Theodosius in this memorialized image is somewhat at odds with the earliest sources for this incident. Indeed, Drake considers the image of Ambrose barring Theodosius' entry into the church to be a conflation of the boldness shown by Ambrose in the Callinicum affair, including the confrontation between the bishop and the emperor in church recounted in Letter 41, and the meekness shown in response to the Thessalonian massacre.<sup>38</sup>

As in the case of the Callinicum incident, the earliest reference to the Thessalonian massacre comes from Ambrose himself.<sup>39</sup> In his letter to Theodosius, Ambrose pleads with the emperor to repent for his authorization of the massacre, noting that while he has a “zealous faith,” he also is plagued with a “naturally hot temper.”<sup>40</sup> On the one hand, Drake overstates his case when he writes that Ambrose “ever so gingerly raised the possibility of denying [Theodosius] communion.”<sup>41</sup> No, Ambrose is clear: Theodosius has sinned, he should repent, and Ambrose will not offer the Sacrifice with Theodosius present until the emperor does the required penance.<sup>42</sup> Nevertheless, Drake is correct that there is an altogether gentler tone to Letter 51, in which the Thessalonian massacre is discussed, than to Letter 41,

---

<sup>38</sup> *Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 2000) 441-451.

<sup>39</sup> Letter 51.

<sup>40</sup> Letter 51.4.

<sup>41</sup> *Constantine and the Bishops*, 443.

<sup>42</sup> Letter 51.13.

in which Callinicum is discussed. He is also correct that in the next three sources that discuss the Thessalonian massacre – Ambrose’s funeral oration for Theodosius, Augustine’s *City of God*, and Paulinus’ biography of Ambrose – while each discusses Theodosius’ repentance, none so much as mentions Ambrose confronting Theodosius at the entrance to the church.<sup>43</sup> The only incident similar to this confrontation in these earlier writings is Ambrose’s recollection of the Callinicum affair in Letter 41.

For our earliest narrative which *might* be taken as a confrontation at the church entrance in relation to the Thessalonian massacre, we turn to Sozomen, who writes:

I have also been informed, that a faithful slave voluntarily offered to die instead of his master, who was being led to the place of execution. It appears that it was for these and other acts of cruelty that Ambrose rebuked the emperor, *forbade him to enter the church*, and excommunicated him. Theodosius publicly confessed his sin in the church, and during the time set apart for penance, refrained from wearing his imperial ornaments, according to the usage of mourners.<sup>44</sup>

Yet the phrase “forbade him to enter the church” could just as likely be a summary of Ambrose’s declaration that he will not offer the Sacrifice with Theodosius present, as it is an account of Ambrose physically preventing Theodosius’ entry. For such an explicit account, we must turn to Theodoret.

Theodoret is more detailed than Sozomen, both in his account of the massacre and its aftermath. For instance, he is our earliest extant writer to number the slain in Thessalonica, recording that 7,000 people were “mowed down like ears of grain in harvest-tide.”<sup>45</sup> After recounting the massacre, Theodoret writes, “News of this lamentable calamity reached Ambrosius. The emperor on his arrival at Milan wished according to custom to enter the church. Ambrosius met him outside the outer porch and

---

43 Drake, *Constantine and the Bishops*, 443.

44 *Hist. Eccl.* 7.25; emphasis added.

45 Theod. *Hist. Eccl.* 5.17.

forbade him to step over the sacred threshold.”<sup>46</sup> Ambrose’s letter to Theodosius is not mentioned. Drake is likely correct, then, in seeing in Theodoret’s account a conflation between the incidents at Callinicum and Thessalonica. We can see a clear progression from Ambrose’s having discussed both events in correspondence with Theodosius and Paulinus recording them in his biography to Sozomen leaving out the account of Callinicum and summarizing Ambrose’s threat as forbidding Theodosius to enter the church to Theodoret’s likewise omitting the Callinicum incident, expanding Sozomen’s comment about forbidding entry into the church into the church, and constructing a scene in which Ambrose’s letter to Theodosius is conflated with their confrontation in church following the Callinicum incident as related by Ambrose.

We can see further that Theodoret’s omission/conflation of the Callinicum affair begins to crystallize in later narratives of church history and Ambrose’s life: Callinicum is omitted while the Thessalonian massacre and its aftermath are recorded in the histories of John Malalas,<sup>47</sup> Theophanes the Confessor,<sup>48</sup> Cedrenus,<sup>49</sup> and John Zonaras.<sup>50</sup>

This is also illustrated in later hagiography. Following Theodoret’s *Religious History* (not to be confused with his *Ecclesiastical History*), later biographies of saints came to be more and more condensed in such a way that a short biographical sketch of the saint’s life could be read on the saint’s feast day. Through key events in the saint’s life, this sketch highlighted certain character traits deemed honorable and worthy of emulation in the saint’s life. In such sketches of Ambrose’s life, a consistent character trait highlighted is his speaking truth to power, and the primary event illustrating this trait is his confrontation with Theodosius over the Thessalonian massacre, often modeled on Theodoret’s conflation of the account with the Callinicum incident. This incident is sometimes paired with his successful intervention to remove the altar of Victory from the Senate house, but never with the

---

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>47</sup> Malalas *Chron.* 13.43.

<sup>48</sup> Theoph. *Chron.* 1.72-3.

<sup>49</sup> *Comp. Hist.* 1.556-559.

<sup>50</sup> *Ep. Hist.* 13.18.

Callinicum affair. Two examples, originating in different centuries and geographical locations, will illustrate this point. First, the 11<sup>th</sup>-century Byzantine *Menologion* of Basil II records the following of Ambrose:

Saint Ambrose also actively participated in civil matters. Thus, the emperor Gracian, having received from him the "Exposition of the Orthodox Faith," removed - by decree of the saint - the altar of Victory from the halls of the Senate at Rome, on which oaths were wont to be taken. Displaying a pastoral boldness, Saint Ambrose placed a severe penance on the emperor Theodosius I for a massacre of innocent inhabitants of the city of Soluneia (Thessalonika). For him there was no difference between emperor and common person: having then released Theodosius from the penance, the saint would not permit the emperor to commune at the altar, but compelled him to stand together with all the flock.

Here, the text moves directly from the altar of Victory affair to the Thessalonian massacre affair, with no mention of the Callinicum affair which occurred between these two incidents. This narrative does not rely upon Theodoret's conflation.

Our next example, however, from the 13<sup>th</sup> century, clearly shows reliance and further elaboration upon Theodoret's scene. In Jacobus de Voragine's *Golden Legend*, we read the following:

It is found written in a chronicle that the emperor Valentinian<sup>51</sup> was wroth because that in the city of Thessalonica the people had stoned to death his judges that were sent thither in his name, and for to avenge the same the emperor did do slay five thousand persons, great and little, good and evil, and as well them that had not trespassed as them that had deserved it. And when after this occasion he came to Milan and would enter into the church, S. Ambrose came against him and defended him the entry, and said to him that

---

51 Note the confusion of Theodosius with Valentinian.

after so great woodness thou oughtest not to do so great presumption, but peradventure  
thy power suffereth not thee to acknowledge thy trespass. It appertaineth that reason  
surmount power.<sup>52</sup>

These two examples illustrate how key incidents from Ambrose's life came to be crystallized in memory and used in brief sketches of his life to illustrate desirable character traits. We also see the Callinicum incident, in which, according to our earliest source (problematic as it is), Ambrose actually did challenge Theodosius in the church and refuse to offer the Sacrifice unless he repent, is completely omitted (though at times conflated), just as it is in histories beginning with Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. That is not to say, however, that everyone from Theodoret to the Enlightenment was unaware of Callinicum. In addition to penning Ambrose's life, Paulinus had compiled and edited his letters, which continued to be widely read and circulated throughout the centuries.<sup>53</sup> One writer who drew on the Callinicum affair was the ninth-century highly anti-Semitic archbishop of Lyons, Amulo Lugdunensis, who viewed the incident positively and used it to persuade Charles the Bald to implement anti-Jewish policies.<sup>54</sup> But in lives of the saints and ecclesiastical histories, the Callinicum incident seems to have gone unmentioned for more than a millennium after Paulinus' biography of Ambrose. Why is this the case?

It seems to me that the compilers of Ambrose's life and the church historians of the centuries following Paulinus saw Ambrose's course of action in response to the synagogue destruction in Callinicum to be incongruous both with the memory of Ambrose they were constructing/transmitting and the example they saw his life setting for others. While many today may find it easy to see why Ambrose's response to Theodosius would be embarrassing to later Christians, this does not necessarily follow from the evidence from late antiquity. It becomes apparent in reading most of the church fathers,

---

52 Trans. William Caxton, 1483.

53 McLynn comments on Paulinus' editing and preserving the Ambrosian corpus: "Paulinus can have had no idea of the ammunition he was providing for the bishop's future critics." *Ambrose*, 146.

54 *Contra Iudeos* 53; *PL* CXVI 180-181.

whether Greek, Latin, or Syriac, that they did not hold synagogues in high regard and would not be unhappy about their destruction. Indeed, in addition to the fiery rhetoric hurled against the synagogue by such figures as John Chrysostom, Aphrahat, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Ambrose himself, there are abundant references in our extant literature to the destruction of synagogues by Christians and attempts to expel Jews from certain areas. In addition, Theodosius, along with many other Christians in antiquity are hailed for their destruction of polytheistic temples.<sup>55</sup> It seems clear that at least some writers, including those just mentioned, viewed the synagogue as no less a house of unbelief than the polytheistic temples.

Nevertheless, in late antique historiography and hagiography, there does not seem to be a tendency to laud praises on figures who destroy synagogues, as there is for those who destroy polytheistic places of worship. Consider, for instance, the destruction of the synagogue at Menorca in the early fifth century, which comes closest to doing so. Yet instead of stating that Christians set fire to the synagogue, it makes “fire” the subject: “Fire consumed the synagogue itself and all of its decorations.”<sup>56</sup> The Christians, meanwhile, while seeing the fire as a victory from God,<sup>57</sup> are busy gathering up all the silver in the synagogue to return to the Jews. We see in this account, therefore, on the one hand rejoicing at the destruction of a synagogue as a houses of unbelief, while at the same time a hesitance to ascribe the fire to the Christians and an attempt to present them as blameless.

I believe the same tendency – to preserve even the harshest polemic against the Jews while presenting the Christian as blameless – in part accounts for the omission of the Callinicum affair in later accounts of Ambrose’s life. To actually be responsible for the destruction of a synagogue, or in the case of Ambrose to be personally responsible for the prevention of just retribution following the burning of a synagogue, was seen to be too much in conflict with the otherwise peaceful portrayal of

---

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Ambrose, *De obitu Theodosii* 38

<sup>56</sup> *On the Conversion of the Jews* 13.

<sup>57</sup> *On the Conversion of the Jews* 14.

the saint. Why this same unwritten rule did not apply to the destruction of polytheistic places of worship, which again is praised throughout the hagiographical literature, is beyond the realm of the present study, although I imagine it has to do with the “closer” beliefs of Jews and Christians (shared past, [to an extent] shared Scriptures, monotheistic devotion to the God of the Hebrew Scriptures, etc.).<sup>58</sup>

Yet thanks to Paulinus, Ambrose’s recollections of the Callinicum event remained for posterity, and especially with the rise of critical history, eventually the incident was reinserted into accounts of Ambrose’s and Theodosius’ lives, a subject to which we now turn.

### **III. Reincorporation of Callinicum**

As mentioned previously, I have at present been unable to pinpoint when precisely the Callinicum incident begins to be reincorporated into the historical narratives of the late fourth century or of biographies of Ambrose and Theodosius. The final section of this paper is by no means exhaustive, but will examine a very small sample of works from the late seventeenth to the early twentieth century which discuss Callinicum. While the Callinicum incident was by no means a new discovery in the seventeenth century, it was nevertheless newly inserted into historical and biographical accounts of the late fourth century and, hence, caused no small amount of cognitive dissonance for those writing about this period. We will see emerge four ways in which this cognitive dissonance plays itself out in these accounts.

One rather lengthy depiction of the affair can be seen in the late seventeenth-century *Ecclesiastical History* of Claude Fleury.<sup>59</sup> However, it is lengthy because it is largely a detailed summary of the Callinicum affair based on Ambrose’s letters and Paulinus’ biography, rather than a

---

58 I am not proposing that the hagiographical portrayal of the Christian saint as blameless is the only factor to account for the omission of the Callinicum incident in later tellings of Ambrose’s life, but one among several to consider. Liebeschuetz, 93-94, is likely correct also in seeing Ambrose’s ultimate failure in this incident as accounting for its omission: Ambrose may have won this battle with Theodosius but to have lost the “war” against the synagogue, as subsequent laws were passed even during Ambrose’s lifetime within the next few years protecting synagogues against Christian mobs.

59 *The Ecclesiastical History of M. L’Abbé Fleury*, trans. anon. (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1842 [1683]) 160-164.



thorough interpretation. There are, nevertheless, some important unique elements to his summary. A few details are added to Fleury's account which are missing from Ambrose and Paulinus. For instance, Ambrose mentions an anonymous man who during the reign of Julian "threw down an altar, and disturbed a sacrifice, [and] was condemned by the judge a suffered martyrdom."<sup>60</sup> Fleury identifies this man (supposedly quoting Ambrose!) as Mark of Arethusa,<sup>61</sup> which brings up the question as to whether Fleury had access to sources for the event now lost to us. However, he makes another comment which is of more concern to us in a study of the reception of this event. The comment is made in the midst of a long (creative) quotation of Ambrose's Letter 40 which goes on for more than two pages. After Ambrose's comment that Theodosius' decision will force the bishop of Callinicum into a dilemma of being a martyr or an apostate, Fleury comments, "St. Ambrose says this because the Christians thought it unlawful for them to contribute in any manner whatsoever to the exercise of a false religion."<sup>62</sup> This comment seems to me more than merely a helpful contextual note for his readers; rather, Fleury is creating a framework of justification in which to portray Ambrose's actions. Ambrose's actions are justified by his moral conscience in relation to his religious beliefs.

Another work worth mentioning which justifies the actions of Ambrose in regard to Callinicum is Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, which is the only explicitly hagiographical work which mentions the event. The account of the Callinicum affair in this work is only a few lines long, and is mostly a summary of the incident, based largely on Paulinus' account. Nothing is said specifically to justify Ambrose's actions, but the inclusion of the incident in a work such as this along with other works for which Ambrose is praised certainly gives the impression that that author sees his actions as justified.

Other treatments are not so kind to Ambrose. Writing a few decades after Fleury in England, Jacques Basnage wrote a massive history of the Jews, considering his work a continuation of Josephus'

---

<sup>60</sup> Letter 40.17.

<sup>61</sup> Fleury, 161.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*

*Antiquities* down to the present day.<sup>63</sup> This work “won him a reputation as the first historian sympathetic to Jews and their history. In fact, Basnage used Jewish history as a polemical tool to attack Catholicism in the highly charged confessional and self-consciously critical atmosphere of the seventeenth century.”<sup>64</sup>

Basnage’s rhetoric comes out in full force in his discussion of Callinicum. Theodosius emerges as the hero of the story who manages to pass his laws protecting the synagogue despite the best efforts of the “violently angry” Ambrose. Seeing no reason for Ambrose ever to have involved himself in the affair, he comments, “But there are a sort of Men so bold, as to think that they can do any thing, provided they walk and talk under a Cloak-Religion.” He continues, “‘Tis a strange thing to see Bishops talk at this insolent and haughty rate, and to apply to the Jews of his time the Prohibition that God gave *Jeremy* of Praying for this People.”<sup>65</sup> For Basnage, no amount of justification can account for Ambrose’s actions.

We see a similar vilification of Ambrose in the well-known *magnum opus* of Edward Gibbon. In his *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, he portrays Ambrose as holding an undue power over Theodosius, such that “every measure of civil government may have some connexion with the glory of God and the interest of true religion.”<sup>66</sup> For Gibbon, Ambrose’s Letter 40 is written in “most pathetic terms,” and attributes to Ambrose the equation of “the toleration of the Jewish, as the persecution of the Christian, religion,”<sup>67</sup> which, while not far off the mark, does go further than Ambrose’s words. He favorably cites Bayle and Barbeyrac as having “justly condemned the archbishop.”<sup>68</sup>

---

63 *The History of the Jews from Jesus Christ to The Present Time, Containing Their Antiquitie, the Religion, Their Rites, the Dispersions of the Ten Tribes in the East, and the Persecutions This Nation Has Suffered in the West, Being a Supplement and Continuation of the History of Josephus*, tr. Thomas Taylor (London, 1708).

64 Jonathan M. Elukin, “Jacques Basnage and the *History of the Jews*: Anti-Catholic Polemic and Historical Allegory in the Republic of Letters,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 53:4 (1992) 606.

65 Basnage, *History*, 548.

66 Vol. III (New York: AMS, 1974; reprinted from 1909; originally published 1781).

67 *Ibid.* 183.

68 *Ibid.*

Perhaps the greatest vilification of Ambrose in regard to this incident is given by Heinrich Graetz, quoted at the beginning of this paper. For Graetz, the bishop of Milan was not only “violent..., [and] ignorant of all theology,” but “he was even more virulent against the Jews.”<sup>69</sup> Having written his letter to Theodosius regarding Callinicum with “such sharp, provoking terms,” Ambrose goes on to accuse “the Jews of despising the Roman laws, and mockingly taunted them with the fact that they were not permitted to set up any emperor or governor in their midst, nor to enter the army or the Senate, nor even to eat at the table of the nobles; they were only there for the purpose of bearing heavy taxes.”<sup>70</sup>

It is worth considering at this point that the three authors we have surveyed thus far exemplifying the vilification of Ambrose in light of Callinicum, while illustrating a shift in the presentation of Ambrose’s character, should not properly be discussed in terms of cognitive dissonance. Graetz’ Jewish perspective on Jewish history presumably does not begin with an admiration for Ambrose, who as we have noted, was never friendly to Judaism. Gibbon’s work, as is well-known, is not friendly to Christianity, which he treats as having “supplant[ed] in an unnecessarily destructive way the great culture that preceded it” and chides the church for “the outrage of [practicing] religious intolerance and warfare.”<sup>71</sup> As already noted, Basnage’s history is largely characterized by his anti-Catholic polemic.

But not all writers of the period in question fall neatly into the camps of justification or vilification, and it is in these writers that we can especially speak of cognitive dissonance. In these writers, we see the maintenance of a positive portrayal of Ambrose while his response to Callinicum is deemed unfortunate. It is essentially the portrait of an essentially good man making a mistake.

---

69 Graetz, *History*, 614.

70 *Ibid.*

71 Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*

One such writer was James Craigie Robertson, whose *History of the Christian Church* was published in 1874. He quotes Millman approvingly that “the Old and New Testament...met in the person of Ambrose – the implacable hostility to idolatry, the abhorrence of every deviation from the established form of belief; the wise and courageous benevolence, the generous and unselfish devotion to the great interests of humanity.”<sup>72</sup> Given this estimation, Ambrose’s response to Callinicum is puzzling: “We may be inclined to wonder that Ambrose, if he failed to see the injustice of the position which he advanced, and its inconsistency with any sound principles of civil government, was yet not led to suspect its truth by the consideration that it would have warranted the oppression of a Christian minority by heathens, or of an orthodox minority by heretics.”<sup>73</sup> He goes on to disapprovingly cite Ambrose’s mentioning churches destroyed by Jews under Julian, “as if these acts were sufficient precedents for a justification of the Mesopotamian outrages.”<sup>74</sup> Despite this blight on Ambrose’s career, however, Robertson soon redeems him, immediately moving on to discuss “an interposition of a more creditable nature,”<sup>75</sup> i.e. his response to the Thessalonian massacre.

A similar presentation can be seen in B. J. Kidd’s 1922 *History of the Church to A.D. 461*.<sup>76</sup> He introduces Ambrose as a great teacher and pastor who “made himself accessible to every one, and was full of sympathy...As a preacher, he wielded an extraordinary power...[over such men as] Augustine.”<sup>77</sup> His quarrels with Theodosius are framed by the comment that “it is hardly to be expected that the two most lordly spirits of their age...would not come into collision.” But of course, such great men would not remain at odds with each other for long, due “most of all, [to their] fear of God.”<sup>78</sup>

He illustrates Ambrose’s character in conflict with Theodosius first by recounting the scene when the emperor attempted to seat himself within the sanctuary reserved for clergy in Constantinople.

---

<sup>72</sup> Vol. I (New York: Ott, Young, and Co., 1874) 381.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, 387-388.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, 388.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>76</sup> Volume II (Oxford: Clarendon, 1922) 359-360.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 335.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 359.

Ambrose sent him out, as although he was emperor, he was not ordained.<sup>79</sup> When discussing Callinicum, he considers Ambrose to have “pushed his influence too far.”<sup>80</sup> He considers Theodosius’ original planned course of action to have the bishop and Christians in Callinicum pay for the rebuilding of the synagogue an example of “even-handed justice, and well within the province of civil authority.”<sup>81</sup> That Jews may have been formidable at this time “may explain, though it can scarcely excuse, the fanaticism displayed by Ambrose in this unfortunate and ill-balanced letter” which was “deservedly unsuccessful.”<sup>82</sup> Ambrose’s moment of bad judgment is explained by the “stealthy growth of sacerdotalism, in the bad sense of the word” from whose spirit “even so great a bishop as Ambrose was not wholly free.”<sup>83</sup>

James Parkes offers a similar nuanced perspective in *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue*.<sup>84</sup> His portrayal of this incident occurs in a very balanced chapter on the fourth century, in which the Church “now became possessed not only of official recognition – which [Jews] enjoyed already – but, increasingly, of power over the whole executive machinery of the empire.”<sup>85</sup> Situated following short sections on Hilary and Chrysostom, Parkes’ portrayal of Ambrose and the Callinicum incident comes as close as anything we have surveyed so far to an objective historical account of the affair. Ambrose is neither vilified nor excessively praised. Rather, the bishop of Milan is situated historically in a crucial century in which “Judeo-Christians, though they still existed, had lost all influence,”<sup>86</sup> as the parting of the ways became more solidified. He offers very little of his own commentary, other than to wonder how Ambrose’s arguments to Theodosius would have worked on himself when he was governor.<sup>87</sup>

---

79 *Ibid.* This scene is also often recounted in hagiographic portraits of Ambrose’s life.

80 *Ibid.*

81 *Ibid.*, 360.

82 *Ibid.*

83 *Ibid.*

84 London: Soncino, 1934.

85 *Ibid.*, 157.

86 *Ibid.*, 154.

87 *Ibid.*, 168.

But the tension between upholding Ambrose as a Christian saint and condemning his response to Callinicum is perhaps nowhere better seen than in the account of the Jewish convert to Christianity, Alfred Edersheim. Having praised Theodosius' efforts to defend the Synagogue against growing Christian fanaticism, he writes of the "great Bishop of Milan" whose defense of the Christians in Callinicum "was so little in accordance with the religion which he taught."<sup>88</sup> Though his treatment of this incident is brief, his portrayal is characteristic of the Christian historians from the seventeenth through the early twentieth centuries who discuss Callinicum: Ambrose's positive memory is maintained, while his response to Callinicum is condemned as incompatible with Christian teaching. This incompatibility, however, need not mean the Christian historian omits the incident from the historical record, as we see in fifth-century historians and later hagiographers. This decision is indicative of the movement in this period away from hagiographical portraits and towards a more critical form of biography and historiography.

This movement away from hagiography was by no means universal, of course. Shorter versions of the saint's life which lacked mention of Callinicum continued to be read in Anglican, Roman Catholic, and Eastern Orthodox churches. Historians of this later period are not immune to hagiographical tendencies. As a single example, even so great an historian as Philip Schaff, writing in the middle of the nineteenth century, manages a seven-page biographical sketch of Ambrose at the conclusion of this *History of the Christian Church* without a single mention of Callinicum. Rather amazingly, he writes of Ambrose, "He did not meddle in secular matters, nor ask favor of the magistracy, except when he could put in a word of intercession for the unfortunate and for persons condemned to death in those despotic times."<sup>89</sup> He then goes on to detail two such instances: not

---

88 *History of the Jewish Nation After the Destruction of Jerusalem Under Titus* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1896) 509.

89 Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. III: Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity (New York: Scribner's, 1867) 963.

surprisingly, the affairs of the Altar of Victory and the Thessalonian massacre. This follows the basic presentation of Ambrose we see above in earlier church histories and hagiographies.

#### IV. Conclusion

David Riches has noted that “‘violence’ strongly connotes behaviour that is in some sense illegitimate and unacceptable...However, for the performer of violence this particular implication may well be played down or even be completely absent.”<sup>90</sup> Early Christian historical accounts of the destruction of sacred space are no exception. While attacks on churches are seen as violent, Christian saints otherwise remembered as non-violent are hailed for the destruction of polytheistic temples. When I began this study, I expected to see Christian historians adopting a perspective similar to Ambrose’s own stated position: It is not violent to destroy a house of unbelief, and it borders on violence to require Christians by law to violate their consciences by building such a house of unbelief, even if they are rebuilding a piece of property they themselves had destroyed. What I have found forces us to nuance this perspective, at least in regards to the destruction of synagogues. It seems clear from the writers I have surveyed that they have, with a few exceptions, departed from Ambrose’s own self-justification. This incident was an embarrassment, by and large, for the writers we have surveyed, and hence it was deemed best left out of hagiographical portrayals of Ambrose’s life, including works of church history.

I was also surprised by the historians I surveyed from more recent centuries. Here I had expected to find more Christian historians justifying the incident, subtly (or perhaps not so subtly) continuing the *contra Judaeos* Christian polemical tradition. What I have found instead for the most part is the continued embarrassment by historians who wish to revere Ambrose on the one hand while condemning (or rather forgetting) his response to Callinicum on the other.

---

90 “The Phenomenon of Violence,” in David Riches (ed.) *The Anthropology of Violence* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986) 1.

## Bibliography

- Ambrose of Milan. *The Letters of S. Ambrose of Milan*. Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church. Anonymous Translator. Oxford: James Parker and Co., 1881.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *On Abraham*. Trans. Theodosia Tomkinson. Etna: CTRS, 2000.
- Augustine. *The Confessions of Saint Augustine*. Trans. John K. Ryan. New York: Doubleday, 1960.
- Baron, Salo Wittmayer. *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*. Vol. II: Christian Era: The First Five Centuries. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1937.
- Basnage, Jacques. *The History of the Jews from Jesus Christ to The Present Time, Containing Their Antiquitie, the Religion, Their Rites, the Dispersions of the Ten Tribes in the East, and the Persecutions This Nation Has Suffered in the West, Being a Supplement and Continuation of the History of Josephus*, tr. Thomas Taylor. London, 1708.
- Boozer, Anna Lucille. "Forgetting to Remember in the Dakhleh Oasis, Egypt." In *Cultural Memory and Identity in Ancient Societies*, edited by Martin Bommas. Cultural Memory and History in Antiquity. London: Continuum, 2011.
- Chin, Catherine M. "Built from the Plunder of Christians": Words, Places, and Competing Powers in Milan and Callinicum." In *Religious Competition in the Greco-Roman World*, edited by Nathaniel P. DesRosiers and Lily C. Vuong, 63-76. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.
- Edersheim, Alfred. *History of the Jewish Nation After the Destruction of Jerusalem Under Titus*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1896.
- Elukin, Jonathan M. "Jacques Basnage and the *History of the Jews*: Anti-Catholic Polemic and Historical Allegory in the Republic of Letters." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 53:4 (1992) 603-630.
- Figuerola, Gregory. *The Church and the Synagogue in St. Ambrose*. Washington, D.C.: CUA Press, 1949.
- Fleury, Claude. *The Ecclesiastical History of M. L'Abbé Fleury*. Trans. anon. (Oxford: John Henry Parker) 1842 (1683).
- Gaddis, Michael. *There is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ: Religious Violence in the Christian Roman Empire*. The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 39. Berkeley: UC Press, 2005.
- Gibbon, Edward. *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. Volume III. New York: AMS, 1974, reprinted from 1909 (1781).
- Graetz, Heinrich. *History of the Jews*. Volume II. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1893.



- Hahn, Johannes. "The Challenge of Religious Violence: Imperial Ideology and Policy in the Fourth Century." In *Contested Monarchy: Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth*, edited by Johannes Weinand, 379-404. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- McLynn, Neil B. *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital*. Berkeley: UC Press, 1994.
- Michel, Robert. *Holy Hatred: Christianity, Antisemitism, and the Holocaust*. New York: Macmillan, 2006.
- Parkes, James. *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue: A Study in the Roots of Antisemitism*. London: Soncino, 1934.
- Riches, David. "The Phenomenon of Violence." In *The Anthropology of Violence*, edited by David Riches, 1-27. New York: Blackwell, 1986.
- Robertson, James Craigie. *History of the Christian Church*. Vol. I New York: Ott, Young, and Co., 1874.
- Sanzo, Joseph E. and Boustán Ra'anan. "Mediterranean Jews in a Christianizing Empire." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Attila*, edited by Michael Mass, 358-375. New York: Cambridge, 2015.
- Sizgorich, Thomas. *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity: Militant Devotion in Christianity and Islam*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.
- Sturken, Marita. "Personal Stories and National Meanings: Memory, Reenactment, and the Image." In *The Seductions of Biography*, edited by Mary Rhiel and David Bruce Suchoff. New York: Routledge, 1996.